

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3-19, 21, 26, 27 and 33 are active in the case.

The Examiner is thanked for the courteous interview conducted on September 14, 2004 in which the issues in the case were clarified. The Examiner agreed, pending review of the response, that amending Claim 18 to delete “as such” and to add “alone” in its place and to delete “at least one of” and add “, and mixtures thereof” would make Claim 18 allowable and the addition of the phrase “with air” after the term “solid” in the last line of Claim 26 would make Claim 26 allowable, also.

Claims 18 and 26 have been amended, as described above. Claim 4 has also been amended to delete the phrase “at least one” and to replace it with the original language “, and mixtures thereof” to avoid any problem like that associated with Claim 18. Basis for the amendment to Claim 18 may be found on page 10, lines 10-17 in which it is clear that the phraseology “...can be used, as such or mixed with other elements which are not subject to redox reactions; the reactive phase thus obtained can, in turn, be used as such or suitable dispersed or supported on compounds such as silica, alumina or other pure oxides such as those of magnesium, calcium, cerium, zirconium, titanium, lanthanum, but also mixtures thereof” indicates that the redox element thus described can be used alone. This amendment is also supported by the language of present Claim 8. No new matter has been added into the amended claims.

It is requested that this amendment be entered, since it places the claims in condition for allowance.

The rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite is traversed.

Application No. 09/810,561
Reply to final Office Action of April 2, 2004

The amendments to Claim 18, discussed above, place claim in conformance with 35 U.S.C. §112.

The rejection of Claims 3-19, 21, 26, 27 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as containing subject matter not described in the specification is traversed.

As discussed above, the amendment to Claim 18 places Claim 18 in conformance with 35 U.S.C. §112. The amendment to Claim 26 also places Claim 26 in conformance with 35 U.S.C. §112.

The objection to the specification under 37 C.F.R. §1.74 for failing to include a "Brief Description of Drawings" is obviated by the amendment to the specification supplying a "Brief Description of Several Views of the Drawings" as set forth in M.P.E.P. §608.01(a) and §608.01(f).

It is submitted that Claims 3-19, 21, 26, 27 and 33 are allowable and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Roland E. Martin
Registration No.: 48,082

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
REM:aif